

An oral, procedural proposal by the United Kingdom Delegation to refer the eight procedural articles to the Sixth (Legal) Committee for consideration at the current session was adopted by 32 in favour (including Canada), 3 against, with 9 abstentions. In the Third Committee, Canada voted for the preamble and the three Articles individually and for the resolution as a whole. The final vote was 35 in favour, 3 against (Afghanistan, Turkey, United States), with 13 abstentions. No vote was taken on the procedural Articles 4-11 pending an examination of them by the Sixth Committee. The General Assembly, in plenary session, adopted without discussion a proposal that it "take note of the preamble and the first three Articles of the draft Convention and decide to place this item on the provisional agenda of the eleventh session".

Before casting Canada's vote in favour of the three articles and preamble, the Canadian Representative, Mrs. J. Houck, stated that the Canadian position was one of general approval of the text of the draft Convention as submitted by ECOSOC. While the Canadian Government had initially believed that this was a matter which could more appropriately be considered by the International Law Commission in the context of its broader study, it had come to the conclusion that the nationality of married women could be dealt with separately from the general question of nationality.

Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights

At its twentieth session the Economic and Social Council approved a resolution, proposed by the United States Delegation in the Human Rights Commission, authorizing the Secretary-General to provide advisory services with respect to any subject in the field of human rights, including the rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and in the draft International Covenants on Human Rights. These advisory services, which would include the services of experts, fellowships, scholarships and seminars, would be consolidated with the Technical Assistance Programmes already approved by the General Assembly "relating to the promotion and safeguarding of the rights of women, the eradication of discrimination and the protection of minorities, as well as to the promotion of freedom of information".

In the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee during the 1955 General Assembly, the United States Delegation spoke at length in support of the resolution. They considered that the United Nations should be ready to provide advisory services to governments that wished to have them, since the promotion of human rights was one of the main purposes of the organization. They emphasized that the draft resolution was a rational consolidation of a number of existing resolutions authorizing assistance in various aspects of human rights and would, furthermore, fill some gaps. As to the value of assistance in human rights they argued that, among other things, the proposed programme would provide opportunities for exchanging information and experience concerning the solution of a variety of problems in this field. They also pointed out that the advisory services to be established would constitute a self-contained programme and would not have any detrimental effect on existing technical assistance programmes.

A number of delegations, including Australia, Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom, expressed doubts concerning the value of the proposed programme, pointing out that few governments had taken advantage of advisory services already available under the various resolutions which the ECOSOC draft resolution attempted to consolidate. These delegations also doubted whether in fact the programme would further the cause of human rights